8495 Fontaine Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80925

ADDENDUM 1
COMPUTERIZED MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

REF: Questions and Responses Regarding the WWSD CMMS RFP

1. Please confirm method of submission –
   - BidNetDirect has Place Bid option set up for this RFP – WWSD RESPONSE: Please follow the requirements in Section 7.0 of the RFP noted below.
   - RFP doc requesting 1 original, 10 bound copies, 1 usb – WWSD RESPONSE: this is somewhat incorrect. There is no USB submittal. The electric submittal is via email (lucas@wwsdonline.com or rob@wwsdonline.com), see excerpt from RFP below:

7.0 SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

The proposal and copies of the proposal shall be submitted as follows:

- One (1) executed hard copy original, clearly marked on the cover.
- One (1) electronic format indexed and bookmarked Adobe PDF file via email.
  - The PDF file shall be formatted to be read electronically and to easily accommodate color printir standard page sizes of 8.5-inches by 11-inches and 11-inches by 17-inches. This file must not be restricted or password protected. If there is a conflict between paper and electronic copies o Proposal, the District, in its sole discretion, shall determine which version shall control and precedence.
- Ten (10) additional comb-bound hard copies of the proposal

An individual authorized to execute legal documents on behalf of the Respondent shall sign the prope The proposal shall be received no later than 2:00 pm, MDT on **January 3, 2025**. The time and dat receipt will be based on the District's physical acceptance of the Proposal. Postmarked, facsimile electronic timestamps will not be determinative of the time of receipt. Respondents are solely respons for the timeliness of their submissions. The District will accept hand delivery of proposals at the Front I Counter in Widefield Water and Sanitation District's Administration Building located at:

> 8495 Fontaine Blvd.
> Colorado Springs, CO 80925

Alternatively, Proposals may be mailed to the following address:

> **Widefield Water and Sanitation District**
> **8495 Fontaine Blvd.**
> **Colorado Springs, CO 80925**
> **Attn: Lucas Hale**

2. In an effort to follow Federal Government climate change and reduced carbon emission policies would the District consider electronic submissions of the proposal and waive the requirement for mailed hard copies/USB? - WWSD RESPONSE: the District will not waive this requirement.
3. If hard copies are required would the District consider extending the due date by 1-2 weeks to avoid busy holiday delivery services? - WWSD RESPONSE: the District will not extend the deadline.
4. Is there a desired "Go-Live" date? WWSD RESPONSE: Our expectation is to have completed implementation and to have been running live for some time prior to December 31, 2025. We will work with the selected vendor regarding time frames.
5. What is the District's budget for this CMMS project? Can the District share the budget? WWSD RESPONSE: Yes, there is a budget. However, we have not finalized or approved the 2025 budget at this time. The pending budget amount for this project is $150,000. We are less focused on budget and more focused on meeting the needs of the District.
6. What is the current CMMS system? WWSD RESPONSE: We currently use NexgenAM. This was the first CMMS system for the District purchased 12 years ago.

7. What is the motivation for replacing this system? WWSD RESPONSE: NexgenAM was not properly implemented. Additionally, all users have access to everything. As an example, all users can add assets, create asset classes, create custom fields, etc. This has caused numerous issues with the data within the current system. There is a substantial amount of erroneous data within this system. Our current expectation is that we will not be moving data from this system due to the quality of the data. We also have two workorder systems (maintenance and customer service workorders). Ideally, we would like to have a system that combines or integrates the customer service workorder system with the CMMS system. We are currently unable to do this with NexgenAM. Finally, due to the issues with the data in the current system, we are not able to use the system for analysis for failure or efficiency improvements or budget analysis.

8. Given the President's policies for climate change and reduced carbon emissions the Federal Government no longer accepts paper submissions for RFPs. Many State Agencies and Corporations are following that initiative. Would WWSD consider an electronic emailed submission instead of paper submissions for this RFP? WWSD RESPONSE: No, please refer to Section 7.0 of the RFP for submittal requirements.

9. What is the form and format of existing asset data to be migrated into the new platform (Work Order information, photos, related data)? WWSD RESPONSE: As noted above, the data in NexgenAM is not currently viable. As result, we have spent over $100k this year performing an asset inventory. With this inventory, we have photos for those assets, serial numbers, locations, child asset information, etc. These are the vertical assets, with some linear assets included in this inventory. All of the remaining linear assets are in the GIS system, which is update to date and has good data. In sum, we have two pools of asset data, our inventory list and the GIS system.

10. Are there existing workflows that define business processes related to the maintenance of various asset types? WWSD RESPONSE: We do have some limited procedures associated with certain assets and asset classes. We would look to the selected vendor for help, recommendations, expansions and improvements of these workflows and recommendations for additional/new workflows.

11. What are the asset types (vertical and/or linear) managed in the current system? WWSD RESPONSE: The current system is supposed to manage both; however, as previously noted that data in the current system is untenable.

12. What is the size of the total portfolio of the District owned assets to be managed? WWSD RESPONSE: Vertical assets – 884 identified through the most recent asset inventory plus linear assets in GIS.

13. What is the current Inventory management system? WWSD RESPONSE: We do not have one. However, we track meter inventory in Microsoft excel.

14. How many inventory warehouses are in operation at present? WWSD RESPONSE: We have 1 meter warehouse. We will need to track parts inventory that is generally stored at each facility location and some inventory that is in operator vehicles as well as the aforementioned meter inventory.

15. What is the approximate number of inventory items stocked in these warehouses? WWSD RESPONSE: 500 est. most of this is meter inventory at 300, the remaining 200 inventory of parts is usually location specific or operator vehicles.

16. Does the District plan to initially implement new or existing workflows? WWSD RESPONSE: We have very limited and basic workflows for work order processing. Most of the preventative maintenance is based on specific O&M manuals.

17. Does the District have an existing library of PM procedures to be loaded into the system? Are they available for all asset classes? WWSD RESPONSE: We have limited PM procedures most are based on O&M manuals.

18. What is the expected (existing) volume of ad-hoc and PM work orders? WWSD RESPONSE: 1,176 maintenance workorders in 2023.

19. For the 32 Users can you provide the expected number of users by User Roles? WWSD RESPONSE:

    System Administrators – Users responsible for System Administration including System configuration, Audits, access control, User ID and Authorizations etc. 2 users

    Primary Named users - with Read / Write privileges to access the entire system, exercise all functional capabilities, retrieve and update data, and generate reports and analysis. 22 users – however, we cannot have employees in this category that have the ability to add assets or make significant changes to assets other than maintenance or basic data input functions. The major problem with NexgenAM is that all users have access to everything within NexgenAM, which has contributed to the issues with the data in the system. Too many chefs in the kitchen.

    Executive users – focused on performance information access, Key performance indicators, dashboards, reports, and analysis. 8 users

20. Can the staff resumes be submitted in an appendix and not count towards the 25-page count limitation? WWSD RESPONSE: No, key personnel is one of the key elements included in the 25 pages. Section 6, Item number 6 on page 10 of the RFP.

21. Would you consider increasing the page count to 30 pages to allow for more detail in response to WWSD's requirements? WWSD RESPONSE: We will not be extending the page limit. However, responses to the excel spreadsheet Exhibit A and B are not considered as part of the 25-page count.

22. In reading through the attached PDF, I don't see any contact, email, or link listed in which we are supposed to send questions or the final proposal to. Are you able to supply this information? WWSD RESPONSE: Please send questions to Lucas@wwsdonline.com

23. Could you please provide context into why the RFP question deadline is only one week from the publication date? Understanding the reasoning will help us align our efforts internally. Additionally, we would like to request a one or two-week extension on the question deadline. The current question deadline is not sufficient to thoroughly review all documents and consider questions for clarification. If granted, we would like to use the additional time to review the documents in-depth with our team so we can provide clear responses and address the district's needs. WWSD RESPONSE: We currently do not have the time, the manpower, or the resources to have a longer question timeframe to accommodate the barrage of questions. The RFP is detailed and thorough for the District's needs and requirements regarding the CMMS software. We will not be extending the deadline.

24. Does the District have a budget in mind for the project? If so, please share that threshold. WWSD RESPONSE – currently the 2025 budget (which has not been approved but will in a few weeks) is $150,000.
25. Has the District participated in product demonstrations in the last 18 months? If so, which vendors did you see? WWSD RESPONSE – No, we have not.
26. Can you explain how the District developed RFP requirements? Did the District work with a consultant to build this RFP? If so, which consultant did the District work with? WWSD RESPONSE – The RFP was based on the District's operations, prior experience, Enterprise Asset Management Plan, and prior experience with the existing CMMS system. We did not use a consultant.
27. Of the 32 concurrent users can you provide a breakdown of roles for each user type: Admin, Field User, Reporting, Requesters? WWSD RESPONSE – Admin 2-3 users, Field User – 25 users, Reporting – 2-3 users, Requesters – 3-5 users
28. Would the District allow electronic submissions as an alternative submission format to account for any shipping delays caused by holiday post office closures in the weeks leading up to January 3rd? WWSD RESPONSE – No, please refer to Section 7 of the RFP for submittal.
29. Would the District consider a remote or hybrid approach to implementation and training? WWSD RESPONSE – we would prefer in person training. Part of the issues with the existing CMMS system is that staff was not properly trained. Training is very important to the District regarding the selected CMMS software. However, we would entertain alternative if there associated cost savings.
30. How does the District track its assets and work today? If any, can you share which software solutions are being used today? WWSD RESPONSE – The existing CMMS system cannot be relied upon. As a result, the District spent $100k over the past year conducting an asset inventory and asset condition assessment. We use ArcGIS for the horizontal assets which has reliable data. The new CMMS would use the asset list from the aforementioned inventory and the ArcGIS for setup and implementation. The District would not be transferring or converting data from the existing CMMS due to the numerous errors within the data.
31. Was a consultant involved in writing the RFP? If so, will the consultant be involved in the decision-making process? WWSD RESPONSE – No consultant was used in drafting the RFP. However, we do use our engineering firm as a consultant on occasion.
32. Do you require that the awarded vendor be headquartered in the United States? WWSD RESPONSE – Yes, the vendor must be headquartered in the United States.
33. What is the anticipated project start date and desired go-live date for the solution? WWSD RESPONSE – as noted in Section 10 of the RFP, begin April 14, 2025. The project would need to be completed by September 2025. These dates are subject to change based on the selected vendor as noted in the RFP.
34. To follow environmental and sustainability practices, would the District please consider allowing us to submit our proposals via email in lieu of hard copy proposals? WWSD RESPONSE – No, please refer to Section 7 of the RFP for submittal.
35. Our Sample Statement of Work, which includes our detailed implementation plan and methodology, is typically over 20 pages. Are we permitted to submit this as an Appendix to our proposal and it be excluded from the 25-page limit? WWSD RESPONSE – You are welcome to submit the proposal as you see fit. However,

please refer to Section 7 of the RFP for the requirements, which is part of the evaluation and selection. We are not waiving the 25 page limit. However, the required Exhibit A and B (excel document) are not counted toward the 25 page count.

36. How many end users are anticipated? WWSD RESPONSE – expected to need 32-35 users.

37. Is the District open to a phased implementation? WWSD RESPONSE – WWSD is open to suggestions from vendors regarding implementation strategies.

38. For system integrations, could the District please provide:

39. What is the System name and version? WWSD RESPONE – See Section 5 of the RFP. The two main integrations are Datawest billing software known as BillMaster and ESRI ArcGIS. Both are relatively newer versions. Additionally, WWSD will require an API interface for other ad hoc integrations for future growth.

40. Is this a One way or two way data exchange? WWSD RESPONSE – all need to be two way data exchanges to achieve maximum utilization and efficiency.

41. What is the sync frequency? WWSD RESPONSE – Datawest/BillMaster will need to sync twice daily for each business day. ESRI ArcGIS may be able to sync at a minimum of once per month. There also needs to be data validation checks and balances to ensure that integrations do not generate errors.

42. What data points are exchanged? WWSD RESPONSE – Datawest/BillMaster data points exchanged are meter assets and work orders. ESRI ArcGIS data points that are exchanged are horizontal assets and associated information.

43. What is the goal of the integration? WWSD RESPONSE – the goal of the integration is to have only one software for Operational facing staff. Currently, we manage two work order systems, and we have to manage two sets of asset systems between CMMS and ArcGIS.

44. Does the integration require real-time data transfer or batch imports? WWSD RESPONSE – WWSD is open to either, assuming you can achieve the requirements noted in the sync frequency question above.

45. Is there a Rest API available for the integration? WWSD RESPONSE – For BillMaster, I believe no. For ArcGIS, I believe yes.

46. For data conversions, could the District please provide:

47. What is the system name?WWSD RESPONSE – ArcGIS and BillMaster as noted above. Most of the horizontal assets are in ArcGIS. Some of the horizontal assets and all of the vertical assets are in an Excel spreadsheet. We spent $100k for an inventory of assets, which generated the excel spreadsheet list.

48. What is the quality of the data? WWSD RESPONSE - It is mostly good quality data. There may need to be some manipulation for inclusion within your system.

49. What data will be converted, i.e., work, cost history, inspection history, request history, etc.? WWSD RESPONSE – Our existing CMMS and its related data is not useable. We will essentially start from the beginning with the ArcGIS information and the asset inventory list noted above. The data in the existing CMMS cannot and should not be transferred to the new system due to the massive number of errors with the data.

50. What assets would need to be in this project? WWSD RESPONSE – all of WWSD's assets that are in current operations above $5k in value or deemed to be critical to operations.

51. Was a consulting team (or vendor) utilized to prepare the RFP and requirements? If so, whom? WWSD RESPONSE – No, we did not use a consultant.

52. General Information -> What is the current MGD capacity for the District, what is the future MGD with anticipated growth? WWSD RESPONSE – Wastewater Treatment Facility is 1.8-1.9 MGD per day, water production in the summer months can meet or exceed 5 MGD per day.

53. Integration – DataWest/BillMaster - does this software application run on-premise or in the cloud, are there open API's available to connect with this database? WWSD RESPONSE – Application runs on-premises, there is a open API to the database. However, requires special configuration based on cybersecurity requirements for maintaining PPI data.

54. General Information -> How many total assets are estimated to be managed? WWSD RESPONSE – 843 vertical plus horizontal contained within the ArcGIS system.

55. General Information -> What is the current state CMMS platform and what has worked well, what has not worked for the District? WWSD RESPONSE – We use the current CMMS simple to document work orders. Frankly, the current CMMS was not implemented properly. Additionally, all users have administrative rights to the software. We will not be converting or transferring any data from the current CMMS due to the numerous errors within the data. The data is untenable. Unfortunately, we cannot perform any sort of analysis such as expected failure or run time analysis due to the issues with the data.

56. General Information -> Does the District have a vertical asset hierarchy established today? WWSD RESPONSE – Yes, we have an Enterprise Asset Management Plan, which is our guidance document for asset management.

57. General information -> Does the District desire Criticality assessments and ranking of assets/systems by Criticality scores? WWSD RESPONSE - Yes, we have an Enterprise Asset Management Plan, which is our guidance document for asset management.

58. General Information-> Does the District current have Condition Assessment scores for existing assets? How often are condition assessments completed typically? WWSD RESPONSE – Recently, we had our engineering firm complete an inventory and condition assessment of assets. Unfortunately, we have not been able to effectively manage condition assessments in the past due to the inadequacies of the existing CMMS system.

59. Category B, Linear Assets, Functional requirement # 2.7: Is this functionality intended to support 3rd party contractors that may need to access the water agency's work orders? Or is the intention to have non-water departments creating and executing work orders for non water-related work? Please provide an example use case for the intended capability. WWSD RESPONSE – It is the second option you noted. We have a number of situations where we have other governmental agencies such as El Paso County or City of Fountain that are repair or overlaying roads where our infrastructure is located. We need the ability to track these projects. Ideally, if we could tie them to our horizontal assets it would help us to ensure manholes and valve covers are not paved over. We also have other projects that may be crossing our infrastructure or be near our infrastructure. It would be helpful if we had a way to track these projects or at a minimum document these projects even though we do not control them.

60. Category C, Work Planning and Scheduling, Functional requirement # 3.10: Please clarify the requirement, specifically "revised hours by craft to completion." WWSD RESPONSE – we usually estimate the time for completion regarding the number of hours for specific work orders. We were looking for a way to track the budgeted hours vs the actual hours of time by work order.

61. Category E, Inventory Control & Purchasing, Functional requirement # 1.16: Does the District currently utilize a system to perform purchasing/procurement? WWSD RESPONSE – we currently do not have a system with the exception of Amazon for some items. We currently rely on our Accounting Department.

62. Category A - CMMS Requirements – Section 7 – Mobile Technology: Do crews use tablets to complete work orders out in field? Any standard device platform mobile technology (ex. IPad) - If tablets are used, are the devices cellular connected, or just Wifi enabled? WWSD RESPONSE – Crews currently use Ipads out in the field. They are using cellular connections but also have Wifi capabilities.

63. Category D Section 2 Callibration Management -> Is any callibration measurement automated or available via SCADA systems, or is this entirely manual monitoring and measurements? Please expand this specific use case and need? WWSD RESPONSE – We are in the process to moving to an automated data gathering system for SCADA. Currently, we are hybrid with manual and some automation. What we are looking for here is that we would like the ability to have PM work orders generated automatically based on set points for equipment use or flows.

64. Category E: Section 1 Inventory Control and Purchasing -> Is there an ERP used today to issue and manage POs for ordering/reorder of materials? How is inventory managed today, how many inventory locations are in scope? WWSD RESPONSE – We simply use Excel to manage inventory, which is for meters only. We do not have a current system for parts inventory, which is part of the need for a new CMMS system. We have inventory stored as separate locations for redundancy. However, most inventory is stored in at the Operations Center.

65. Category G – Analysis/Reporting -> Does the District leverage any reporting platform today (PowerBI/Tableau, etc)? WWSD RESPONSE – We currently do not. We would like to use PowerBI, but our data from our current CMMS system is unusable for such purposes.

66. What is the annual software budget for this project? WWSD RESPONSE: The pending implementation budget is $150,000, which has yet to be approved for 2025. The implementation budget is expected to be approved in the next couple of weeks. The annual expected budget for fees will be determined based on software and vendor selection, but currently the District spending $15,000 per year on our existing system. Annual cost of the software will be part of the evaluation process as noted in the RFP.

67. What solution or solutions is the District currently using as their CMMS? WWSD RESPONSE: We currently use NexGenAM.

68. Have you had any solution demos? If so, which solutions? WWSD RESPONSE: None to date.

69. What is the anticipated start date and go live date of the project? WWSD RESPONSE: April 14, 2025 with an expected completion date of September 2025. However, we will work with the selected vendor regarding this time frame based on factors and implementation strategies as needed.

70. Can the District provide more detail on the data that must be converted? (How much data or how many years' worth of data) WWSD RESPONSE: The data will be from ArcGIS, asset inventory list from Microsoft Excel, and some meter and work order information from DataWest/BillMaster billing software. We will not be using any data from the existing CMMS due to the numerous errors in the data. The data within the existing CMMS system is unusable.
71. Of the 32 Concurrent Users, how many of those will be: Administrators, Managers, Field Staff WWSD RESPONSE: Administrators – 2-3 users, Managers – 5-7 users, Field Staff-25 users
72. Will any of the Field Staff require offline access to the application? WWSD RESPONSE: It would be helpful as some of our facilities have limited cell reception or internet access due to the remote locations. However, this is not required.
73. What current CMMS Solution is being used? WWSD RESPONSE – NexGenAM
74. Will the District please provide a copy of Appendix E – Professional Services agreement? WWSD RESPONSE – Posted to the website and Bidnet.
75. How many environments does the District desire for the new CMMS? WWSD RESPONSE – Ideally one environment.
76. Does the CMMS Solution need to be FedRamp compliant? WWSD RESPONSE – No.
77. Please provide a list (number) of users that will require system access by role to estimate licensing. WWSD RESPONSE: Administrative Users – 2-3, Supervisor/Manager Users – 4-5, Field Users/Data Entry/Work Order processing – 25 users
78. In Section 6.0, the RFP states that proposals must not exceed 25 pages. Please confirm that the following sections are not included in the page limit:
    Cover/Title Sheet
    Cover Letter (RFP 6.1)
    Responses to Functional and Technical Requirements Matrix (RFP 6.4)
    Resumes of Primary Staff and Key Personnel (RFP 6.6)
    Cost Proposal including CMMS Project Cost Sheet (RFP 6.8)
    Professional Services Agreement Additions or Exceptions (RFP 6.10)
    Example Workflows (Appendix C)
    Data Conversion Tools and Methods (Appendix D)
    WWSD RESPONSE: Please follow the requirements in Section 7.0 of the RFP noted below.
79. For the electronic proposal file that must be submitted (RFP 7.0), please confirm if vendors are expected to include the CMMS Project Cost Sheet and Functional and Technical Requirements Matrix Excel sheets as separate attachments or as part of the indexed and bookmarked Adobe PDF file. WWSD RESPONSE – please include in both.
80. If a vendor has more than five (5) references, will the District consider and evaluate Experience/References above the minimum? (RFP 6.7) WWSD RESPONSE – The requirement is a minimum of 5, you are welcome to submit more as long as you are complying with the other requirements of the RFP.
81. Please confirm the number of integrations associated with this RFP. Additionally, the number of touchpoints per integration if possible and the integration directions. WWSD RESPONSE – two integrations with a standard API interface for future integration. The touchpoints for BillMaster are twice daily data

synchronization regarding work orders from the BillMaster system. We are currently operating two work orders systems. The expectations are to only have one, which would be the new CMMS software. We need integration with BillMaster. The ArcGIS touchpoint is a monthly synchronization of the GIS software and the CMMS software.

82. What are the expectations regarding data migration from the legacy systems not included in Appendix D? Examples:

83. Is there an expectation to move all historical transactional data for work orders, purchase orders, labor hours, parts used, etc.? WWSD RESPONSE – No information would be moving from the existing/legacy CMMS system. The data in the current CMMS system is useable and untenable. We are essentially starting again. We have spent considerable time and money performing at asset inventory over the past year of all vertical and some horizontal assets. Most of the District's horizontal assets are contained within the GIS, ArchGIS, system. The aforementioned data sets, the asset inventory list and condition along with the ArchGIS system information are the data migration expectations.

84. Is there an expectation of project work to be conducted onsite, remote, or hybrid other than on-site assistance during system go-live and final acceptance testing? This impacts overall expense costs associated with the project. WWSD RESPONSE – We do expect some onsite assistance. We do expect trainings to be conducted in person, especially initial trainings. While cost is a factor in the evaluation, the overall product and useability of the product is of most importance to the District.

85. Does the District currently have custom reports that will need to be migrated or re-designed to the new system? WWSD RESPONSE – As previously noted, we will not be migrating any information from the existing system. Our reporting is currently very limited due to the erroneous data with the existing CMMS system. We are looking to expand reporting. The primary reports we use currently are number of work orders by time frame and number of completed or outstanding/pending work orders.

86. TASK 5 – acceptance testing. "Respondents shall include a test plan"~ Does the District expect a test plan to be part of this response or as a deliverable for the project? WWSD RESPONSE – A high level explanation or understanding of a plan is expected. We are looking more for your process of testing and data validation.

87. What is the total number of environments preferred by the District for the CMMS application? Typical is 3 (Development, Test, and Production). WWSD RESPONE – 3 is great. At a minimum a Test and Production. Our existing CMMS system has issues between the Test and Production, which do not match or operate in a similar fashion.

88. Should data remediation, cleansing, and normalization be considered as part of the RFP response? If so, can a total asset count & parts count be provided? WWSD RESPONSE – we have already done a lot of the data cleansing. Total assets are 843 plus horizontal assets from GIS. In regards to Parts, we have at least 300 meters that need to be inventoried and various parts at various locations. These other parts would be less than 500. However, we would like a more robust system to track parts. Unfortunately, in the existing CMMS system parts, inventory, and assets have been rolled into the same data set, which makes most of the data unusable.

89. Please confirm no Computer-Based Training is required. Is standard application/user training acceptable in a Train-The-Trainer approach? WWSD RESPONSE – While computer based training is not required, it would be helpful. Part of the failure in the existing CMMS system was not enough or not thorough enough training. I am not a fan of the train-the-trainer approach as the existing CMMS system utilized that approach, which has been unsuccessful. Training is very important to WWSD. We would expect a robust training process regarding the software implementation.
90. Is the budget slated for this solicitation able to be shared? WWSD RESPONSE – the current budget is $150,000. However, it has yet to be approved, but it is expected to be approved this month at the budget hearing.